Horace O'Bryant School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Horace O'Bryant School

1105 LEON ST, Key West, FL 33040

https://www.keysschools.com/domain/496

Demographics

Principal: Brian Desilets J

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	60%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

> * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Monroe County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Horace O'Bryant School

1105 LEON ST, Key West, FL 33040

https://www.keysschools.com/domain/496

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School PK-8	Yes	54%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	77%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Monroe County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

We are committed to working collaboratively to provide a safe, positive, learning environment in which all children will be engaged, lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Creating the BUCs of tomorrow!
Becoming Life-Long Learners--Foster a love of learning
Ultimate Achievement--High academic achievement
Character--7 C's-Live by the Buccaneer Code of Honor
Success--Goal setting-Reach for your goals and dreams

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Desilets, Brian	Principal	Provide leadership, guidance, and supervision to all aspects of academic and extracurricular programming.
Vinson, Steven	Assistant Principal	To perform those tasks assigned by the building principal and assist in the development and continuous implementation of elementary and middle school programs which meet the needs and promotes the well-being of all students in the school.
Ring, Dana	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach's primary responsibilities include, but are not limited to: assist teachers in data driven, student centered planning processes that intensify instructional focus on students' mastery of essential standards and develop standard based curriculum, resources, assessments and intervention programs for and with teachers.
Meier, Scott	Assistant Principal	To perform those tasks assigned by the building principal and assist in the development and continuous implementation of elementary and middle school programs which meet the needs and promotes the well-being of all students in the school.
Ray, Monet	School Counselor	The School Counselor's primary goal is to encourage, support, and foster positive academic, career, social, and personal development for students in schools.
Smith, Nicole	Assistant Principal	To perform those tasks assigned by the building principal and assist in the development and continuous implementation of elementary and middle school programs which meet the needs and promotes the well-being of all students in the school.
Murray, Nanette	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach's primary responsibilities include, but are not limited to: assist teachers in data driven, student centered planning processes that intensify instructional focus on students' mastery of essential standards and develop standard based curriculum, resources, assessments and intervention programs for and with teachers.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Brian Desilets J

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
8

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
84

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	60%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	47	58	46	65	64	63	208	193	217	0	0	0	0	961
Attendance below 90 percent	13	5	6	13	5	7	8	7	13	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	7	24	33	44	0	0	0	0	111
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	15	42	28	49	0	0	0	0	136

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	2	8	16	19	37	0	0	0	0	82

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	5	1	3	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	16

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 10/19/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	75	57	65	65	71	60	209	233	199	0	0	0	0	1034
Attendance below 90 percent	10	1	7	7	6	3	7	8	13	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	7	17	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	19	19	50	72	56	0	0	0	0	220

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	3	3	2	7	7	19	0	0	0	0	41

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Number of students enrolled	75	57	65	65	71	60	209	233	199	0	0	0	0	1034
Attendance below 90 percent	10	1	7	7	6	3	7	8	13	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	7	17	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	19	19	50	72	56	0	0	0	0	220

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	3	3	2	7	7	19	0	0	0	0	41

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	**District**	**State**	**School**	**District**	**State**
ELA Achievement	56%	64%	61%	53%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	61%	59%	55%	64%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	51%	54%	46%	53%	51%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	58%	66%	62%	58%	68%	58%
Math Learning Gains	60%	64%	59%	59%	67%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	51%	52%	47%	56%	50%
Science Achievement	58%	67%	56%	54%	67%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	80%	85%	78%	74%	85%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	51%	70%	-19%	58%	-7%
	2018	43%	62%	-19%	57%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	58%	-4%	58%	-4%
	2018	60%	66%	-6%	56%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
05	2019	50%	62%	-12%	56%	-6%
	2018	51%	58%	-7%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
06	2019	56%	57%	-1%	54%	2%
	2018	53%	56%	-3%	52%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
07	2019	51%	58%	-7%	52%	-1%
	2018	53%	56%	-3%	51%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	56%	60%	-4%	56%	0%
	2018	61%	64%	-3%	58%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	49%	62%	-13%	62%	-13%
	2018	44%	63%	-19%	62%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	60%	-8%	64%	-12%
	2018	55%	64%	-9%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	65%	66%	-1%	60%	5%
	2018	60%	60%	0%	61%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
06	2019	46%	53%	-7%	55%	-9%
	2018	51%	55%	-4%	52%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
07	2019	49%	61%	-12%	54%	-5%
	2018	56%	62%	-6%	54%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	53%	61%	-8%	46%	7%
	2018	53%	59%	-6%	45%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	63%	65%	-2%	53%	10%
	2018	71%	64%	7%	55%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	54%	56%	-2%	48%	6%
	2018	60%	60%	0%	50%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	77%	80%	-3%	71%	6%
2018	65%	74%	-9%	71%	-6%
Compare		12%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	99%	70%	29%	61%	38%
2018	100%	76%	24%	62%	38%
Compare		-1%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	69%	31%	57%	43%
2018	100%	72%	28%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	26	44	47	32	44	41	31	51			
ELL	39	52	46	40	55	54	36	62	29		
ASN	77	77		85	62						
BLK	45	48	40	40	54	49	47	82	47		
HSP	52	59	46	55	58	48	50	71	49		
MUL	63	58		66	58		71		69		
WHT	69	64	63	74	69	50	72	91	72		
FRL	49	55	46	50	56	48	48	76	42		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	22	51	54	22	41	35	26	33			
ELL	41	64	68	40	50	49	46	59	14		
ASN	79	57		79	71						
BLK	46	53	43	46	55	36	49	60	43		
HSP	49	62	65	52	55	46	61	62	49		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
MUL	70	76		68	62		62	69			
WHT	72	66	51	73	65	36	78	83	66		
FRL	50	62	57	52	56	42	60	60	37		
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	24	46	45	28	44	35	34	44			
ELL	33	49	44	42	56	49	34	61			
ASN	75	55		92	67						
BLK	36	48	40	40	48	42	44	68	53		
HSP	47	52	48	53	58	49	50	74	48		
MUL	65	55		65	63						
WHT	69	62	51	73	65	47	61	78	59		
FRL	44	49	40	48	55	47	47	69	48		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	68
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	594
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	75
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	52
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	64
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	69
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component with the lowest performance was in the lowest 25% students making learning gains in reading. We believe that one of the contributing factors was the increase in our subgroups represented in the lowest 25% students.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The data component with the lowest performance was in the lowest 25% students making learning gains in reading. Some factors that may have contributed to this decline was teacher assignment and student groupings in reading classes.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was the lowest 25% of students making learning gains in reading. One factor that may have contributed to this gap is the large amount of subgroups represented in the lowest 25%.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The data component with the most improvement was the Florida Civics End of Course Assessment with a gain of 12 points from the previous year. Providing common planning, adjusting teacher assignments and implementing best practices which included using the standards based Study Island program.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Two areas of concern are the amount of course failures in Math (11) and the number of Level 1 on the 2019 statewide Math assessment (136).

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Instructional practice specifically relating to ELA
2. Instructional practice specifically relating to Math
3. Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning
4. Instructional practice specifically relating to closing achievement gaps for our sub groups.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	46% of the students in the lowest 25% (Grades 4-8) in ELA made learning gains.This is a 10 point decrease from 2018-2019.
Measurable Outcome:	58% of the students in the lowest 25% (Grades 4-8) will make learning gains on the FSA ELA Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dana Ring (dana.ring@keysschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	All teachers will receive ongoing training in AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination) evidence based strategies targeting reading in the content areas with an emphasis on strategies for students to engage with technical and informational texts.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Incorporating AVID evidence based strategies school wide will enhance engagement in critical areas such as reading within the content areas.

Action Steps to Implement

1.The School's Literacy Coach will provide instructional coaching and professional development for teachers in AVID based strategies.
2.Targeted students (including MTSS Tier 2 and 3 students) will receive additional support by attending after school tutoring and Saturday STARS tutoring.
3. Grade levels will conduct grade level data meetings.
4 Teachers will reteach and reassess (formative assessments and adaptive progress monitoring).

Person Responsible	Brian Desilets (brian.desilets@keysschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Freckle includes student problem sets that are aligned to state standards and reports that teachers are able to use to interpret students' needs in math instruction. Emphasis on students justifying reasoning and explaining strategies are used. This process not only develops an increase in mathematical understanding, but also contributes to students' development of a positive growth mindset in math.
Measurable Outcome:	54% of the lowest 25% (grades 4-8) will make learning gains as measured on the FSA Math Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nanette Murray (nanette.murray@keysschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will receive ongoing instruction to increase reading/understanding in mathematics. Additionally, support will be provided to teachers on best practices in the use of programs such as Freckle and Myhrw.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Close monitoring of student performance will enable teachers to make timely intervention decisions to support student mastery.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teacher training on best practices in content area reading in mathematics and use of Freckle and Myhrw..
2. Conduct on-going grade level data meetings to assess implementation of strategies.
3. Teachers reteach and reassess using formative assessments and adaptive progress monitoirng.

Person Responsible Nicole Smith (nicole.smith@keysschools.com)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Research indicates that all students are experiencing more stressors and anxiety in today's culture. The academic and social isolation caused by COVID-19 compounded these effects, especially among our lower socioeconomic students who have access to fewer resources. As a result, we realize that Horace O'Bryant students' sense of belonging, safety and physiological needs require immediate attention.
Measurable Outcome:	All students will be assessed in the fall and spring through the use of standardized, universal screeners adopted by the district. Students will be identified and grouped based on the results of the screeners in to Tiers 1, 2, and 3 of the MTSS Behavioral Framework and identified as the lowest 25% in reading and math through progress monitoring. Students will then be paired with an HOB staff mentor to receive academic and research based SEL interventions with the intention that they will achieve growth as measured by the February screener.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monet Ray (monet.ray@keysschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Check In/Check Out, individual and group counseling and specific staff mentoring will be some of the Tier 2 and Tier 3 strategies used to support the lowest 25% of students and any additional Tier 2 and Tier 3 MTSS students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Once students' physiological, safety and sense of belonging needs are met, then they can focus on academic achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students will take the SEL screeners (DESSA/Co-Vitality) in October and February and progress monitor in September, January and May.
2. MCSD Coordinator of Student Support, Assistant Principal, School Counselor and Social Worker will review the data and group students in the MTSS Behavioral Framework as well as the lowest 25% in math and reading.
3. Intervention stratgies will be implemented from November through January.
4. Students will be reassessed in February to SEL measure growth and in January and May for the district PM testing.

Person Responsible	Nicole Smith (nicole.smith@keysschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The School Leadership team has addressed the remaining school wide improvement priority of closing the achievement gap among the students in identified sub groups by offering after school tutoring in groups where students can help each other in their first language, using the instructional coaches to provide coaching sessions with teachers to differentiate instruction to address needs and working with community organizations to support, tutor and mentor students after school and on Saturdays.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

At Horace O'Bryant School, we utilize several methods to engage all stakeholders:
1. Virtual School Advisory Council
2. Pirate Post, Website, Facebook, Remind, Marquee, K-8 Parent Weekly Emails
3. Title 1 Engagement Events/EL Parent Events
4. Virtual Meet the Teacher/ Parent Teacher Conferences
5. HOB's Back to School Task Force and Building Level Planning Team
6. Student placement in Algebra, Geometry, Adobe Photoshop and Microsoft office classes to promote student acceleration.
7. Partnership with Rotary, United Way and local churches to provide Holiday Cheer baskets
8. Quarterly Student Recognition/Weekly Virtual Victor Middle School Student recognition
9. PBIS implementation to consistently improve school wide discipline data and supports Tier 1 SEL strategies
10. Elementary and Middle School SAVE Promise Club, Student Council, NEHS, NJHS and TSIC

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**	$0.00
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning**	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00